To request a Time Extension (TE) or Alternative Diversion Requirement (ADR), please complete and sign this form and return it to your Office of Local Assistance (OLA) representative at the address below, along with any additional information requested by OLA staff. When all documentation has been received, your OLA representative will work with you to prepare for your appearance before the Board. If you have any questions about this process, please call (916) 255-2555 to be connected to your OLA representative.

Mail completed documents to:

California Integrated Waste Management Board Office of Local Assistance, MS 8 8800 Cal Center Drive Sacramento CA 95826

General Instructions:

For a Time Extension complete Sections I, II, III-A, IV-A, and V.

For an Alternative Diversion Requirement complete Sections I, II, III-B, IV-B and V.

Section II: Jurisdiction information and Certification All respondents must complete this section.						
I certify under penalty of perjury that the information in this document is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, and that I am authorized to make this certification on behalf of:						
Jurisdiction Name		County				
City of Duarte			Los Angeles			
Authorized Signature			Title			
Mus R. 4 .			Assistant City Manager			
Type/Print Name of Rerson Signing Date				Phone		
Michael R. Yelton		1-30-02		(626) 357-7931		
Person Completing This Form (please print or type)			Title			
Kristen Petersen			Assistant to the City Manager			
Phone E-mail Address		Fax				
(626)357-7931 petersenk@		petersenk@accessduarte.c	tersenk@accessduarte.com		(626) 358-0018	
Mailing Address	City		State	ZIP Code		
1600 Huntington Drive Duarte		CA		91010		

Section II—Cover Sheet
This cover sheet is to be completed for each Time Extension (TE) or Alternative Diversion Requirement (ADR) requested.
1. Eligibility Has your jurisdiction filed its Source Reduction and Recycling Element, Household Hazardous Waste Element, and Nondisposal Facility Element with the Board (must have been filed by July 1, 1998 if you are requesting an ADR)?
No. If no, stop; not eligible for a TE or ADR.
Yes. If yes, then eligible for a TE or ADR.
2. Specific Request and Length of Request
Please specify the request desired.
☐ Time Extension Request
Specific years requested _2002 & 2003
Is this a second request? No Yes Specific years requested. (Note: Requests for an additional extension will need to address why the jurisdiction's efforts to meet the 50% goal by the end of the first extension were not successful.)
☐ Alternative Diversion Requirement Request (Not allowed for Regional Agencies).
Specific ADR requested%, for the years
Is this a second ADR request? No Yes Specific ADR requested%, for the years
Note: Extensions may be requested anytime by a jurisdiction, but will only be effective in the years from January 1, 2000 to January 1, 2006. An original request for a TE/ADR may be granted for any period up to three years and subsequent requests for TE/ADR may extend the original request or be based on new circumstances but the total number of years for all requests cannot total more than five years or extend beyond January 1, 2006.

Section IIIA—TIME EXTENSION

Within this section, discuss your jurisdiction's progress in implementing diversion programs that were planned to achieve 50%. Provide any additional information that demonstrates "good faith effort." The CIVMB shall determine your jurisdiction's progress in demonstrating "good faith effort" towards complying with AB 939. Note: The answers to each question should be comprehensive and provide specific details regarding the jurisdiction's situation.

Attach additional sheets if necessary—please reference each response to the appropriate cell number (e.g., IIIA-1).

Why does your jurisdiction need more time to meet the 50% goal? Describe why SRRE selected
programs did not achieve 50% diversion. Identify barriers to meeting the 50% goal and briefly indicate
how they will be overcome.

The City needs more time to achieve the 50% goal so that newly established program benchmarks can be reviewed. The City will then be able to move forward in a methodical manner so as to achieve the 50% goal.

SRRE selected programs were unable to achieve 50% diversion due to the inability of the City to correctly assess what their programs had achieved. Program benchmarks were necessary for the City to take decisive action.

The City faithfully implemented its SRRE programs by their respective deadlines. Barriers to meeting the 50% goal include:

(1) The lack of an approved new base year until May 2002 to correct numerical deficiencies in the 1990 base year.

The newly approved 1998 base year study corrected the flawed diversion rate identified in the original base year study. In both 1999 and 2000, the diversion rate has stabilized in the 35 to 45 percent range using the base year adjustment methodology.

(2) The original SRRE overestimated the benchmark diversion rate due to disposal under-reporting in the 1990 study. That led to overconfidence in the SRRE's identified diversion rate and inadequate programming. It wasn't until after establishment of the AB2494 disposal reporting system and the 1998 solid waste generation study establishing a new base year that the diversion rate was found to be low. Unfortunately, this meant that corrective programming similar to what is proposed in this TE was not implemented.

The programming deficiencies are now being remedied as described within this document. The City will work with its franchise hauler, its consultant, and business community to implement new and innovative programs that will enable the City to meet diversion requirements.

(3) Voluntary nature of the SRRE in the commercial sector. While the City remarkably increased its diversion rate in the residential sector with the introduction of the mandatory curbside program coupled with a variable rate, the participation from the commercial sector in the City's on-site voluntary commercial pickup service has been sporadic despite widely disseminated public education materials.

The City is in the process of developing a plan to set up a City-subsidized commercial recycling program, targeting the top 10 generators in the City. The program will be supported by technical assistance such as waste audits and free advice.

(4) Lack of resources to enforce C&D recycling.

This will be overcome by the City staff with the establishment of a new infrastructure that enforces ordinances, penalizes offenders, and monitors the level of compliance.

(5) Erroneous reporting by the DRS and illegal hauling. Due to the City's geographical disadvantage in neighboring County unincorporated area, the City has had problems with misallocated tonnage. It has been impossible to verify correct origins of all of questionable records in the DRS.

The City will work with its franchise hauler to alter collection schedules to minimize confusion and misrecording by scale masters.

The City is reserving the right to implement the MRF based program for the commercial sector in the event selected programs are inadequate.

2. Why does your jurisdiction need the amount of time requested? Describe any relevant circumstances in the jurisdiction that contribute to the need for a Time Extension.

The City needs two years from the date of this submittal to reach the mandate for the following reasons. The City only recently received an approved new base year (May 2002 Waste Board meeting). Without accurate numerical base line information, it has been difficult to gauge the successfulness of existing diversion programs. Nonetheless, in recent years, the City's diversion rate in the residential sector has significantly increased since the City upgraded its solid waste and curbside recycling program. On the other hand, the City's non residential sector represents much higher generation (78%) as compared to its residential counterpart. For that reason, the City has determined to focus its effort on increasing diversion activities in the City's commercial sector. The proposed programs described within are to be newly established, which require careful planning and a new infrastrucure before the full implementation. The City would also need to strengthen interdepartmental cooperation for additional staff time to mandate C&D recycling.

3. Describe your jurisdiction's Good Faith Efforts to implement the programs in its SRRE.

In the Model Annual Report for 2000, the City has detailed its efforts in the PARIS report verifying that all SRRE identified programs have been implemented. Beyond the SRRE programs, the City solicited and submitted applications for WRAP awards for a number of businesses, and widely disseminated educational and outreach materials among the public.

In 1996, the City transformed its solid waste and recycling management by awarding an exclusive contract to a new hauler. The hauler upgraded the City's entire solid waste and recycling services to bring it in line with accepted industry practices in refuse collection and recycling. To encourage residential waste reduction, the City implemented a variable rate structure in 1997. Along with this, the City upgraded its cubside recycling program from crates to automated containers and added mandatory automated green waste recycling. As an incentive to recycle, the City provided containers for both recyclables and green waste free of charge. To support the improved program and raise awareness among residents, the City conducted a comprehensive public education campaign through the print/broadcasing media, City newsletter, brochure and education booth at local events.

4.	. Provide any additional relevant information that supports the request.					

Section IV A—PLAN OF CORRECTION

A Plan of Correction is required by PRC Section 41820(a)(6)(B). The plan is fundamentally a description of the actions the jurisdiction will take to meet the 50% goal by the expiration of the Time Extension. Extension.
Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Residential %			22% Non-residential %				78%	
PROGRAM TYPE Please use the Board's Program Types. The Program Glossary is online at:	NEW O		DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM FUNDING DATE FUNDING COMPLE			ESTIMATED PERCENT DIVERSION		
www.ciwmb.ca.gov/ LGCentral/PARIS/Codes/ Reduce.htm								
Economic Incentives 6010-PI-EIN	New	ten gener Conduct 10 genera programs	rators' expansion of the technical assistance (e ators to set up waste p i.	ogram to subsidize top pir recycling programs. .g., waste audit) to top revention and recycling ors x 0.35 = 609 tons]	User fees	12/31/0	2	1.2%
Ordinances 6020-PI-ORD	New	Enact ord debris an projects (inclusion [11,053 to	linance requiring source d 25% recycling. Set e.g. school district pro of percentage of inert ons x 0.25 = 2,763 tor	e separation of C&D threshhold for large lects). Mandate debris recycling in bids. is]	User fees	6/30/03		5.5%
MRF New 7000-FR-MRF		As an alternative, City will enact MRF processing if above program(s) is inadequate and based on financial feasibility.		User fees	12/31/0	3		
				1.40	·			
		Tot			d/or Expanded Programs			6.7%
				n Rate Percent From Lat		port		44%
			Total Planned Diversion Percent Estimated				50.7%	
	PR	OGRAMS	SUPPORTIN	G DIVERSION A	CTIVITIES	3		
PROGRAM TYPE NEW OF EXPANDED			DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM				TE FULLY MPLETED	
Los Angeles Regional Agen 6030-PI-OTH	icy I	New	As an alternative, City will consider joining a regional agency (Los Angeles Regional Agency). CONTINGENT DIVERSION □□□□□			3		

Collection Rerouting New 6030-PI-OTH		In collaboration with City's franchise hauler, City will alter its trash collection schedules to minimize misreporting and confusion by scale masters.	6/30/03

•		
	·	